impartiality and to assure that there is a neutrality of the type sought by my colleagues on the other side. In fact, it is one of a number of ways.

I might submit, while it is part of our Constitution for many appointments and nominees, I am not at all sure that it is even the best way. It is also riddled with opportunities for candidates to lose who should win and nominees who should lose to win. Frankly, I think a smaller circle representing the entire group might just as well work their will and do better for the people of this country.

So I do not think that I want to change because we have had excellent budget directors, and we have not had the entire Senate vote on them ever before. Who would deny that they have been good, that they have been impartial, and that they are professional? Not a single one came before the U.S. Senate for a confirmation vote to make sure that they were good, that they were neutral, and that they would do a good job.

Lastly, nobody is truly challenging my reputation here. I thank both Senators for their kind remarks with reference to this Senator. But in a sense, they have said in this case you did not do it very well. I think we did it under the circumstances very well. Things are very different. Things are very different than they were 6, 8 or 10 years ago. Clearly, everybody knows that. I mean when the chairman of the House Budget Committee says at a press conference, at which I am with the nominee we have both chosen—he chooses to say what he expects, and I choose to say what I expect. And we are very different in what we expect. But it surely does not mean that what either of us expect is what a well-reputed economist is going to do taking on the mantle of the predecessors, which is excellence personified.

So JOHN KASICH, chairman of the House committee, says that he expects something different out of the budget director than past directors, I said I do not come here to this meeting with the press expecting anything other than a good job and integrity, honesty and a full-faith implementation of your responsibility.

So in a sense, if you add to that the fact that we interviewed a number of candidates, that I did not shut out Democrats from the interviewing process—in the House they do not let them interview. Here we did. I regret in this instance that I did not get the full concurrence of Senator EXON of Nebraska, the ranking member, but actually the letter that he sent, right at the end in one sentence at least, acknowledges that perhaps she is a competent economist, and then suggests we should look at some more. I made a decision that looking for some more was not worthwhile. I will not divulge all the details. But I will tell you it is not very easy anymore to get people to want to come to be interviewed for jobs like this. And I think we ended up with a splendid candidate. I am proud of her.

I respect my fellow Senators on the other side for their feelings. But she is going to be the CBO director, and she is going to do a good job. That is all I can tell the Senate in the same kind of sensitive approach that I have taken in the past, whether I was leader of the crew, or whether I was in the minority helping the process along. She will be a good one.

For those who do not like some of her writings, let me remind the U.S. Senate that every CBO director that we appointed had some writings that some Senators did not like. Some were too liberal in their writings. Some were too conservative in their writings. Some were too supply oriented. But if we are going to judge them as competent economists schooled in American economics from the best of our schools managing different jobs—in this case having worked 4 years for the CBO—and then to second guess with reference to whether they are going to be fair or right or prejudiced, I just do not think we can work all of that out.

So I regret that I cannot agree with those who seek to delay this. It will not be delayed. It should not be delayed. She will be the CBO director. If she is not already, she will be very, very soon.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I intend to withdraw this. Let me make a couple of observations quickly.

The Senator from New Mexico is very able and makes his case aggressively. I must say that I smiled a bit when he reached for the Washington Post for a measure of support for his position. It is not usual to see that coming from that side of the aisle. But, nonetheless, I understood his citation of that editorial.

This is different. The Senator from New Mexico will understand and know when I say that we have not chosen a CBO director in these circumstances where you have people calling for a vote on the previous question in the Budget Committee, not having the ranking minority member on the Budget Committee even having the opportunity to interview the appointee before the decision is made. I think anybody would agree that this process is different.

Again, I would have said to the Senator from New Mexico that I am not making a judgment about Professor O'Neill. I do not know Professor O'Neill. I know economists get in the room, and they like each other and speak well of each other. I am not surprised. I used to teach a little economics. So the fact that the Senator argues that some other economists think well of this economist, that probably is not surprising.

But I must say that I also spoke with Dr. Reischauer, and he told me the same thing the Senator from New Mexico suggested; that his view is that this is a good candidate. I said, ''What do you think of this process?'' He said he did not think much of the process. The other side of it, at least in my discussions with Dr. Reischauer—and I hope he will not mind my disclosing that—was as to process.

We are going to vote on this. We will not vote on it this evening. But I intend to offer this amendment to the next bill, and then I intend to ask for a vote because I think in the future, if we have people who on the one side or other decide they are going to call the previous questions and do these kinds of things, then I think those of us who believe that we ought to have somebody who ought not have questions about them raised after the fact, we ought to have someone who is subject to a vote of approval by the House and the Senate.

So that would be my intention on the next legislation that comes before the Senate. I appreciate the indulgence of the Senator from Utah.

I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the motion that I have previously offered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

So the motion was withdrawn.

Mr. HATCH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period for the transaction of morning business with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FRED STROBLE: EXCELLENCE IN PUBLIC SERVICE

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I rise today to salute Fred Stroble for his 33 years of truly exceptional public service as a law enforcement officer in South Carolina—including more than 23 years as a deputy marshal with the U.S. Marshals Service in Charleston.

As the deputy marshal with the longest continuous service in South Carolina, Fred has been a superb marshal, a public servant whose career epitomizes dedication and loyalty. In all the years that I've known Fred, he has been kind and helpful to everyone, from hard-working citizens to the prominent people he has protected, such as the Reverend Martin Luther King, the Reverend Jesse Jackson, former U.N. Ambassador Andrew Young, U.S. Supreme Court Chief Justice William F. Reinquist, and Associate Justice Thurgood Marshall.

Mr. President, Fred Stroble started his law enforcement career in January 1962 in Charleston as a walking patrolman with the city police department. He came to be known as the nice cop because of his compassion for people